

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 22-26 are pending in the present application. Claims 16-21 are cancelled. Claims 22-26 have been added, and claims 7 and 12 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsuhisa, in view of Benno et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0226054 A1, hereinafter “Benno”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant’s claim 1 recites at least one distinguishing feature that is not disclosed in the references cited by the Office Action. In particular, neither Katsuhisa nor Benno disclose that “the enabling circuit disables the clock receiver for a first time period *after detecting a transition on the internal clock signal*.” The Office Action asserts, “Benno further teaches HOLDING CIRCUIT 203 and an exclusive-OR 205 (i.e. an enabling circuit), receiving both the internal clock and the control signal S21 for disabling the internal clock S12 transitioning for a predetermined period of time (paragraph 0073-paragraph 0079, FIG. 3).” (Office Action, page 3.) Assuming only for the sake of argument that Benno teaches an enabling circuit, Benno fails to teach that the enabling circuit disables the clock receiver for a first time period “*after detecting a transition on the internal clock signal*” as recited in Applicant’s claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that paragraphs 0022 and 0035 of Benno disclose that “the designer can change the period during which the internal clock signal is disabled with flexibility, thus preventing operation under unstable conditions due to external noise.” If the Office Action is asserting that paragraphs 0022 and 0035 disclose that the enabling circuit disables the clock receiver for a first time period “*after detecting a transition on the internal clock signal*” as recited

in Applicant's claim 1, then Applicant respectfully disagrees. Paragraph 0022 of Benno is recited below for the ease of the Examiner. (Paragraph 0035 of Benno contains similar language.)

[0022] According to this construction, the designer can freely set or change *the pulse width* of the operation clock, so as to prevent the computer from operating under an unstable condition caused by the external noise.

(Benno, paragraph 0022, emphasis added.)

It should be noted that the referenced section only discusses setting or changing the pulse width, and fails to disclose disabling the clock receiver upon detecting a transition on the internal clock signal.

The MPEP § 2143 states, "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, . . . the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations." Accordingly, because none of the cited references teach or suggest at least the limitation "the enabling circuit disables the clock receiver for a first time period *after detecting a transition on the internal clock signal*" as discussed above, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Applicant's claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicant's claim 7 recites at least one of the distinguishing features of Applicant's invention. In particular, Applicant's claim 7 recites the limitation "the pulse generator generating a pulse signal for a first time period *upon* detecting a transition in the internal clock signal." The Office Action asserts that signals S21, S32, or S83 of Benno disclose Applicant's pulse. However, S21, S32, and S83 are not generated "upon detecting a transition in the internal clock signal" as

recited in Applicant's claim 7. Rather, signals S21, S32, and S83 are generated upon detecting *noise*, not a transition in the internal clock signal. (Benno, paragraphs 0077, 0091, and 0142.)

Accordingly, because none of the cited references teach or suggest at least the limitation "the enabling circuit disables the clock receiver for a first time period *upon detecting a transition on the internal clock signal*" as discussed above, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Applicant's claim 7 be withdrawn.

Claims 8-15 depend from claim 7 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Roger C. Knapp, Applicant's attorney, at 972-732-1001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, or credit any overpayment, Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

December 20, 2006
Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218

/Roger C. Knapp/
Roger C. Knapp
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,836